

# Viterbo University

## Using the Read Write Web to Build Student Engagement

1 Graduate Credit

Spring 2009

<i>Instructors:</i>	<i>Tammy Lind</i>
<i>Location:</i>	<i>Ben Franklin Elementary, Franklin School District</i>
<i>Dates &amp;</i>	<i>February 16, February 23, March 2, March 9</i>
<i>Times:</i>	<i>4:30-7:30</i>
<i>Email:</i>	<i>lind.tammy@gmail.com</i>
<i>Phone:</i>	<i>414.331.5294</i>
<i>Availability:</i>	<i>Office hours available upon request</i>

### Course Description:

The Internet is rapidly changing to include free rich applications that can be used as powerful learning tools for students. It is now as easy to create information as it is to consume information. This blended course is designed to be an introduction to the basic principles and concepts of the Read/Write Web also known as Web 2.0 tools. Web 2.0 tools are often referred to as online collaborative tools. The course will teach participants the capabilities of Web 2.0 tools, how these technologies interrelate, and applications of these technologies in a classroom setting.

### Objectives:

Upon successful completion of this course, each student should be able to:

- ☐ Share findings in current educational research that support the use of Web 2.0 applications
- ☐ Understand and apply the basic principles and concepts of Web 2.0 tools and its use as a tool for communicating with electronic media

### Conceptual Framework:

The Viterbo University Graduate Studies in Education Program has adopted a Teacher As Reflective Decision Maker Model and the Wisconsin Standards for Teacher Development and Licensure, also known as INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) Standards. Each course is designed to contribute to the development of one or more of the WI/INTASC Standards and if applicable, IRA and/or ISLLC Standards.

Franciscan values permeate the program. The focus of every professional education course is on the learning of the PK-12 pupil. Viterbo education courses infuse constructivist practices, use of technology, PK-12 collaboration, awareness of diversity, traditional and authentic assessment, research, and real-world experiences into the professional development of the teacher.

### **Methodology:**

“Much of what a teacher needs to know (and know how to do) is learned in the context of practice”(Schlanger & Fusco, 2003). The methodology for this course is situated around teacher practice. In other words the design of the professional development is not geared to how to use the technology, but instead on how it can be used to enhance the practice of teaching and learning.

The course supports educators in the evolution of more constructivist styles of teaching with technology. Constructivist or student centered teaching environments are strongly connected to real life and are conducive to incorporating these skills into instruction. In constructivist teaching pedagogy, the roles of teachers and students change. Teachers facilitate learning environments in which students construct deep meaning through solving problems by building on prior knowledge structures. The following table shows the differences between transmission and constructivist teaching styles.

	<b>Transmission Pedagogy</b>	<b>Constructivist Pedagogy</b>
Classroom Activity	Teacher-Centered Didactic	Student-Centered Interactive
Teacher Role	Fact Teller Always Expert	Collaborator Sometimes Learner
Student Role	Listener Always Learner	Collaborator Sometimes Expert
Instructional Emphasis	Facts Memorization	Relationships Inquiry & Invention
Concept of Knowledge	Accumulation of Facts	Relationships Inquiry & Invention
Demonstration of Success	Quantity	Quality
Assessment	Multiple-Choice Items	Portfolios and Performances
Technology Use	Drill and Practice	Communication, Collaboration, Information Access, Expression

Sandholtz, Ringstaff, & Dwyer (1997)

(Sandholtz, Ringstaff, & Dwyer, 1997)

According to Henry, Jenkins, a prominent researcher at MIT, in order for students to be prepared for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century they need to be engaged in participatory cultures. “A participatory culture is a culture with relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing one’s creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby what is known by the most experienced is passed along to novices. A participatory culture is also one in which members believe their contributions matter, and feel some degree of social connection with one another (at the least they care what other people think about what they have created (Jenkins, Clinton, Purushotma, Robison, & Weigel, 2006).

Web 2.0 tools allow students increased engagement and Motivation, a context to create content with an authentic purpose and audience. These tools also allow for increased collaboration. Students can connect with peers and experts using the tools of the 21st century workplace.

(Bjørke, 2004)

(Cole & Engestrom, 1993)

(Cradler, Freeman, Cradler, & McNabb, 2002)

(Dede, 2005)

### **Americans with Disabilities Act:**

If you are a student with a disability and require auxiliary aids, services or other accommodations for this class, please see the instructor to discuss your accommodation needs.

### **Assignments and Requirements:**

#### **Web 2.0 Tools: Application & Analysis 50% of Overall Grade**

Participants will identify a minimum of two Web 2.0 sites that can applied to their teaching situation.

Prepare a one page report for each tool with the following headers:

- ☐ brief descriptor of the tool;
- ☐ how this site can be adapted to the school setting; individual classroom setting; any other educational group;
- ☐ rationale why this specific site will improve students’ knowledge and communication skills
- ☐ include advantages and any cautions/preparation that might be needed when implementing the tool

#### **Participation in Course Wiki 25% of Overall Grade**

Participants will be required to review current educational research that supports the use of Web 2.0 tools. Participants will provide one article link for their peers to review. All links will be posted on the class wiki. The link will also have a brief description to draw the peer’s attention. Once the articles are posted, the participant will review at least three

articles and write a short reflection on what they have learned to enhance their understanding of the power of Web 2.0 tools. Article reflections will be shared on the class wiki.

### **Personal Reflection 25% of Overall Grade**

Participants will write a one page reflection on how they can use the Web 2.0 tools in their personal, professional, and/or academic settings.

### **Evaluation Method:**

100-93=A 92-91=A- 90-88=B+ 87-85=B 84-82=B-  
81-78=C+ 77-75=C 74-70=C- 69-67=D+ 66-64=D  
63-60= D- Lower than 60=F

**Note:** If a student's work cannot be handed in by March 20, this must be brought to the attention of the instructor and approved prior to the due date to prevent a lower grade. Circumstances beyond the control of the student will be considered on an individual basis.

Wiki article posting and reflection is due by March 20, 2009.

Web 2.0 Applications & Analysis reports is March 20, 2009.

The final reflection is due March 20, 2009.

### **General Course Expectations**

Because of the collaborative nature of this program, it is crucial that students attend the entire each time that we meet. Active class participation is expected.

It is expected that all work will be turned in or presented on the assigned dates. Any deviation from the assigned dates must be cleared with the instructor.

#### **Policy on Attendance**

Due to the collaborative nature of this course, **Attendance is mandatory.**

#### **Policy on Late or Missing Assignments**

All original course assignments and additional assignments described above should be completed within the course time limits. Work that is submitted after the course has been completed is subject to the provision of the policies and procedures relating to incompletes.

### **Texts & Readings:**

Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A., & Weigel, M. (2006). *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*: McArthur Foundation.

Jakes, D. (2007). Professional Development and Web 2.0. Retrieved September 3, 2008, from <http://www.techlearning.com/showArticle.php?articleID=196604381>

Polin, L. (2007). Teaching the Net Generation: How can Web 2.0 applications find a home in the classroom without compromising their essential character of engaged community? *Threshold Magazine, Cable in the Classroom, Summer 2007*.

## Web 2.0 Tools: Application & Analysis Rubric

Purpose: Participants will identify a minimum of two Web 2.0 sites

General Information: The scale ranges from 1 to 4 with 4 being exemplary. If the student receives a score below 3.5, the instructor will provide specific feedback on his/her concerns. One re-submit is permissible.

Rubric applies to one Web 2.0. There will be two grades. 25 % for each report.

4	3	2	1
Site has a free to use option Url takes you to the information about the site and free option.	Site does not have a free to use option. Url works however, additional information was unclear.	It is not clear if the site has a free to use option Url works but no additional information was provided.	Missing this point. Free information very hard to find
How site can be adapted to specific setting is complete.	Adaptation is brief and not tied to a specific setting.	Adaptation is brief or not tied to a specific setting	Unsure this point was presented.
Rationale provided how students will improve knowledge and/or communication	Rationale provided how students will improve knowledge or communication	Rationale provided how students will improve knowledge or communication is not appropriate for the tool	Unsure this point was presented
Advantages of tool is appropriate to audience.	Advantages of tool is not tied to a specific audience	Advantages of tool is not clear and/or tied to a specific audience	Tied to an audience but not an advantage.
Cautions/preparations appropriate to audience is defined	Cautions/preparations appropriate to audience is unclear.	Cautions/preparations are not appropriate to audience.	Unsure this point was presented

Missing equals zero points

24-23 = A	22= A-	21= B+	20= B	19=B-
18= C+	17= C	16= C-	15= D+	14= D
13= D-	Below 13 = F			

## **Wiki Participation Rubric**

Purpose: This is to provide students with specific feedback on the class wiki activity.

General Information: The scale ranges from 1 to 5 with 4 being acceptable and 5 being exemplary. If the student receives a score below 3.5, the instructor will provide specific feedback on his/her concerns.

5	3	1	Score
At least 1 Article that supports the use of Web 2.0 tools is shared on wiki.	At least 1 Articles on Educational Technology is shared on wiki.	No articles or resources were shared on the class wiki.	
Chosen article brief description shows a clear grasp and synthesis of the article content	Chosen articles brief description is vague and/or is not tied to Web 2.0 tools.	Chosen articles is technology but is not tied to course content.	
The short reflection is on at least three of the articles posted and includes how the information has enhanced their understanding of Web 2.0 tools.	Reflection is short but is less than three articles but more than one article. The reflection includes vague on incomplete connections to Web 2.0 tools.	Reflection is shared but not tied to articles..	

Possible Score:

15 points

---

Missing work equals zero points.

A = 14-15 B+ = 13 B = 12 C+ = 11 C = 10 C- = 9

D = 8 D- = 7 F = Below 6

## **Topic: Personal Reflection on Web 2.0 Tools in the Classroom**

<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Needs Work</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>5-4 points</b> It is evident that the participant understood the materials shared in this class  Reflection clearly identified how they one can immediately use Web 2.0 tools in a personal, professional, or academic settings.	<b>3-2 point</b> Participant can identify Web 2.0 tool and/or some uses but not clearly.  Participant identifies tools however, he/she does not tie to immediate use in any area.	<b>1 points</b> It is difficult to tell if the participant understands Web 20 tools and their possibilities.  It is difficult to tell if participant can see immediate connections.

Missing work equals zero points.

**Total possible points = 10**

A 10 A- 9 B 8 C 7

F Lower than 7